



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

origin of the law, and of the proof of all this, the pledge or token of its truth, the exodus from Egypt, all of which we find summed up in the prayer, that begins with *אמת שאתה ה' אלהינו*, continues, according to the Sephardic ritual with *אמת מעולם היא שמך* and *עזרת אבותינו*, and ends with *אמת ממערים נאלתנו*. Thus each of these great religious truths is solemnly ushered in with a special *אמת*, a special declaration of faith, as though the order of the prayers had been arranged to indicate the special importance of the thoughts in which Jehuda-ha-Levi beheld the dogmas of Judaism.

I have neither added to nor amplified, but have, on the contrary, given but an inadequate representation of the pious admiration which animates our thoughtful author in his explanation of these prayers. This interpreter of mediæval Judaism is so laconically sparing of words, that he seems in his writings to have left us merely the key to his thoughts, which it then becomes our business to unlock and explain.

The clear introductory words in which Jehuda-ha-Levi sets forth his list of the dogmas of Judaism have been not exactly misunderstood by Judah-ibn-Tibbon, but, at any rate, so rendered in his Hebrew translation (which and not the Arabic original is the text now universally read) as to lead easily to misunderstanding. The Arabian original runs as follows<sup>1</sup> :—

הם יצדד תלך אלעקאיד אתי בהא תתם עקירה אליהודה

Instead of translating the common word *עקירה* by *אמונה*, as was correctly done by all subsequent translators, Ibn Tibbon, in accordance with its etymology, kept servilely to the root of the word, and translated it by *קשר*. The misapprehension of the passage was thus decided. Thus Cassel, Ed. 2, p. 220, speaks of "bonds" which hold Judaism together, and even the pupil of Frat. Maimon Jacob b. Chayim, called Vidal Farissol, in the year 1322 explains the passage in a similar sense. *אשר בקשרי ההם*

*ישלמו קשרי היהודים ואפי' הם מפוזרים בכל הארצות* (Cod. Halberstamm, 274). He had indeed already found the incorrect reading in the words of Judah-ibn-Tibbon. They ought, according to the old MSS. fragments of Halberstamm's, to run thus (No. 139), *אשר בהם ישלמו קשרי דת היהודים*,

The belief (1) in God; (2) in his eternity; (3) in his providential guidance of Israel's history; and (4) in his revelation, are the four dogmas, in which the most national of all Jewish thinkers recognises the shortest exposition of Judaism.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

### What was the Word for "Unhappy" in later Hebrew?

(Baruch ii. 18.)

A certain sentence from the penitential prayer of the exiles, in the apocryphal Book of Baruch (a prayer, by the way, composed quite in the later Muzio style), has always been the despair of translators and commentators. According to the received version of the LXX. text,

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Hirschfeld, p. 166, lines 6 and 7.

the sentence runs as follows : (ii. 17, 18) ἄνοιξον ὀφθαλμούς σου, καὶ ἴδε, ὅτι οὐχ οἱ τεθνηκότες ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ ὧν ἐλήφθη τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν σπλάγχνων αὐτῶν, δώσουσι δόξαν, καὶ δικαίωμα τῷ Κυρίῳ· ἀλλὰ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ λυπούμενῃ ἐπὶ τὸ μέγεθος, ὃ βαδίζει κύπτον καὶ ἀσθενοῦν, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ ἐκλείποντες, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ πεινώσα, δώσουσί σοι δόξαν, καὶ δικαιοσύνην, Κύριε. The context is clear. We know what ought logically to follow in this verse. It is not the dead, says the author, with evident allusion to Psalm cxv. 16, who praise the Lord, but the living, who acknowledge and glorify the divine grace and mercy, even in the midst of trials and temptations. Similarly in Psalm li. 19, a broken spirit, and a broken and a contrite heart are described as the sacrifices most pleasing to God. But how are we to evolve the required logical sequence of ideas from the incomprehensible Greek text? It is evident from the first that we have to do with a mistake of the translator's, who has either misunderstood his original, or servilely translated an error in the Hebrew text. We must seek, therefore, to cast a glance at the original, through what we may call a hole in the outer envelope.

I will not give an exhaustive enumeration of the attempts that have been made to rectify this passage. It may be taken as a proof of its difficulty that such an unfortunate conjecture as Fritzsche's,<sup>1</sup> that the translator had misread גורלה for גוללה, could have met with approval. Hitzig<sup>2</sup> thought he could save the text by the supposition of an original עַל יֵתֶר (after Psalm xxxi. 24), so that ἐπὶ τὸ μέγεθος would translate the Hebrew "very" or "exceedingly." Reusch<sup>3</sup> even goes so far as to insist upon הגויה being taken as the misunderstood word of the original text. Kneucker<sup>4</sup> suggests that הרגל should be set up as the mysterious word. And, to mention the latest remedy which has been applied to the injured sentence, Graetz<sup>5</sup> has endeavoured to find the solution in an original לבב, which the translator has turned into רבה.

In spite of all these failures, I have found courage to suggest another solution, which appears to me so obvious, that my only wonder is that nobody has done so before. The Greek words λυπούμενῃ ἐπὶ τὸ μέγεθος imply a Hebrew original, which the translator read as עַל גּוֹרְלָהּ. As is so frequently the case (cp. a precisely similar example with the very same root in the Massoretic text of Proverbs xix. 19), the ג in the *real* original was either indistinctly written, or had already been miswritten as ג. The author obviously wrote עַל גּוֹרְלָהּ. He mentions the soul that laments its fate or lot as being the first of those who glorify God. The translator, servilely following his text, but stumbling, as we have seen, at the very threshold, was compelled to misunderstand the following portion of the verse אִשֶּׁר יֵלֶךְ כַּפּוֹךְ בְּלִי כֹחַ, and thus to make what is really a new subject—namely, the second class of the true worshippers of God—refer to τὸ μέγεθος.

לֵב וְעֵינַיִם כְּלָל form the last two groups, so that the whole sentence should be thus translated: "but the soul that is grieved because of its lot, they who go bowed down and without strength, the eyes that fail, and the sorrowful spirit give thee glory and justification, O Lord."

<sup>1</sup> *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, I., 184.

<sup>2</sup> J. J. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 243.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Monatsschrift*, 1887, p. 390.

Perhaps the last words of the verse ran originally יִתְּנוּ כְבוֹדָךְ וְצִדְקָתְךָ, for in Judges vii. the LXX. renders יִתְּנוּ צִדְקוֹת by δώσουσι δικαιοσύνην. On the other hand, יִתְּנוּ is sufficiently justified by Jer. xiii. 16.

This simple explanation appears to me also to secure for us an addition to the vocabulary of later Hebrew. It is in close harmony with the way in which the idea of the divine has thoroughly saturated the Hebrew language that an exact equivalent for the words happy and unhappy is not to be found in it. Not till a comparatively late period do we find the words portion and measure used in a metaphorical manner to express the ideas of fate and destiny. Just as the phrase שִׂמְחָה בְּחֵלְקוֹ was coined to convey the words "contented and happy," so the phrase נִעְצָב עַל נִוְרָלוֹ came into use to signify the contrary state. This, I think, I have succeeded in proving from the Hebrew original of the book of Baruch.

D. KAUFMANN.

---